```
1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                      EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 16-CR-254(BMC)
 4
5
            -against-
                                    : United States Courthouse
6
                                    : Brooklyn, New York
7
                                    : Wednesday, October 18, 2017
8
     ROBIN FULLER,
                                      2:15 p.m.
9
              Defendant.
10
11
             TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR SENTENCING
12
                  BEFORE THE HONORABLE BRIAN M. COGAN
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
13
                          APEARANCES:
14
    For the Government:
                          BRIDGET ROHDE, ESQ.
                          United States Attorney
15
                          Eastern District of New York
                              271 Cadman Plaza East
16
                              Brooklyn, New York 11201
                           BY: MOIRA KIM PENZA, ESQ.
17
                              Assistant United States Attorney
18
     For the Defendant:
                           ROTHMAN, SCHNEIDER, SOLOWAY & STERN,
19
                           P.C.
                              100 Lafayette Street
20
                              Suite 501
                              New York, New York 10013
21
                           BY: ROBERT SOLOWAY, ESQ.
22
    Court Reporter: Michele D. Lucchese, RPR
23
                      Official Court Reporter
                      E-mail: MLuccheseEDNY@gmail.com
24
25
    Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography. Transcript
    produced by Computer-aided Transcription.
```

2 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Be seated, please. 1 2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: United States v. Fuller, docket No. 16-CR-254. 3 4 Counsel, please state your appearance starting with the Government. 5 MS. PENZA: Moira Kim Penza for the United States. 6 7 Good morning, Your Honor. With me at counsel table is Steven 8 and Mary Ann Betts from the United States Probation 9 Department. 10 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 11 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Good afternoon. 12 MR. SOLOWAY: Robert Soloway for Robin Fuller. 13 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Good afternoon, Mr. 14 Fuller. 15 All right. I understand there's a preliminary issue. I'm not sure why the Government didn't flag this for 16 me earlier, but the issue is that Ms. Fuller would like to 17 18 address the Court in connection with sentencing. I take it 19 the Government is of the view that notwithstanding that she's 20 not the victim of the crime of conviction, she still has 21 standing to speak as if she is a victim? 22 MS. PENZA: Your Honor, first let me address, I do 23 apologize for not bringing it to the Court's attention 24 earlier. I only learned today that Ms. Fuller would like to 25 make a statement. The Government would ask that Ms. Fuller be

able to make a statement pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3661, which provides that no limitation shall b placed on what the Court may consider at sentencing. And I point the Court to two cases in similar circumstances where an impact statement from a person who is not a victim of the charged crime has been allowed to speak: One was United States v. Weiner, which was 518, Federal Appendix 358. That is a Sixth Circuit's case from 2013. And then the other would be *United States v. Greig*, G-R-E-I-G, 717 F3 D212, and that is a First Circuit case from 2013, Your Honor. I do apologize for not bringing this to the Court's attention sooner, but in those cases we did have similar circumstances and given the nature of the case, I believe that Ms. Fuller's statement should be considered at sentencing.

THE COURT: What is defendant's position?

MR. SOLOWAY: For the reasons that Your Honor just referenced relating to the issue of whether or not Ms. Fuller is a victim of the crime that is the subject matter of this proceeding and is the indicted crime, I am going to oppose notwithstanding the broad language of 3661 because the Crime Victims' Rights Act, which is Section 3771 speaks to the issue of whether victims should be permitted to speak. So I am opposing it on those grounds.

THE COURT: If she fell under the Crime Victims

Protection Act, then she would have the right to speak, I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would have to allow her to speak. She's not protected by the act. She has no such right to speak; however, under the statutes, I believe I can listen to anything that I want to listen to and there is no limitation on what I can receive. It is unfortunate that I am getting hit with this issue cold. Let me just stay here a minute and take a look at the First Circuit case. The Sixth Circuit summary order and an unpublished decision, I'm not sure if it helps me very much. MS. PENZA: I am happy to provide Your Honor with a hard copy, if you'd like. THE COURT: No, I will pull it up. Mr. Soloway, do you have a copy? MR. SOLOWAY: Ms. Penza provided me with a copy -you are talking about *Greig*, Your Honor. THE COURT: Yes. MR. SOLOWAY: And I also have a copy from Ms. Penza of the Sixth Circuit's case, Kevin Weiner, which I just received moments burn entered the courtroom. I did have a chance to scan them. THE COURT: I think I am going to need a hard copy too because my computer is not responding. I have been given a hard copy. Let me look at it. The First Circuit's case, the decision in *Greig* is distinguishable on one ground at least, which is abundant notice had been given to the defendant that the family member

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

was going to speak. That's not the only basis on which the decision was reached by the Court of Appeals, but just as I feel kind of blindsided by learning of this today, and perhaps the Government does too, more importantly, I think the defendant is blindsided by it and that's not the way we are supposed to proceed at sentencing. As a matter of discretion, I am therefore determining not to hear from Ms. Fuller. I will say having heard her testimony, I think I have a pretty good idea of what she would say and I also know she said quite a bit in the pre-sentence report, none of which at this stage, because Mr. Schneider's objections have been withdrawn, are challenged, so I don't really feel the need to hear from her, and rather than complicate the proceeding or have to delay it even further because of this last minute notice that the Government and I got, we are going to proceed without hearing from her.

Let's get on with the sentencing. First of all, I want to return to the Government the pictures of child pornography with which the Probation Department furnished me for purposes of considering them at the sentencing hearing. I am having my clerk hand them back to the Government.

Now, I have, of course, the Fatico hearing. I have the multiple submissions that the parties have made since that hearing. And based on, as I referenced before, the defendant's withdrawal of Mr. Schneider's objections to the

PSR, I think there are only two factual issues that I need to consider in this, the first is whether the defendant has deliberately exaggerated or fabricated his medical condition. That is relevant I think for 3553(a) purposes. And second, did the defendant have a sexual relationship with his daughter either while she was a minor or after she became 18. The Government has the burden on both of those issues, has to prove them in its favor by a preponderance of the evidence.

Now, as I said, the parties have put in a lot of papers on these issues. I have read it all. If there is anything additional that either side wants to say, I will hear from you.

Anything from the Government?

MS. PENZA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: From defense?

MR. SOLOWAY: You know, Judge, there are a couple of things that I want to point out. I don't write lengthy submissions just to come in and rehash things. There has been a lot of paper. You know, we had briefing that included three Fatico legal issues and factual issues. I really just want to sort of articulate one thing, and that is that the positions that I took in a letter that I wrote to the Court in July that was at that time arguing that there would be a due process issue were the hearsay statements of Ms. Fuller to be accepted and credited by the Court for purposes of the disputed

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

guideline and the five-point enhancement. I know that in the letter that I most recently wrote to Your Honor in October I did say that I incorporated all the arguments that I made there and wanted to essentially reiterate. But I do believe, Your Honor, that I haven't really said some things that should be pointed out. So they are new. Specifically, I recall part of the testimony of Ms. Fuller included references to something that, you know, I had never heard before at a Fatico hearing, namely that there was an incident shortly after her father's house was sold in April of 1997 and they began these journeys, and she said that shortly after the house was sold they went to this Arizona hotel where these incidents occurred over a period of a couple of days. My recollection is something like three days, where there was no actual touching involved but that the defendant was watching things and directing her essentially to view him doing certain things.

If you recall, Judge, one of the main things that I have tried to emphasize here is the lack of corroboration, the lack of outcry, the lack of police reports, the lack of credible accounts of corroboration of these things. And one of the things that Ms. Fuller testified to was that there came a time that they went to Idaho who my client's girlfriend, she identified as someone named Gerry was there in Idaho and wanted to take Ms. Fuller with her away from Mr. Fuller but indicated that she was underage, she would be exposed to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

possibility that Mr. Fuller would lodge some kind of kidnap charges, something like that, and that is another person to whom that Ms. Fuller claims to have had a relationship of trust, a relationship of friendship. And now we know that it is allegedly after this Arizona incident, which occurs before the California incident, because the testimony was that she meets up with Gerry somewhere after the Arizona hotel happens where she claims really for the first time with any specifics. So the question becomes not only in general why there's no outcry other than her mother, which has its own problem that I'm not going to go through them again, and I referenced them again in the July letter in terms of the discrepancies that exist there. She's with this person Gerry who she wants to go with, away from Mr. Fuller, allegedly, and there's no indication that she tells her about this incident that So it is just another, in a long string of not just what I consider to be very, very serious discrepancies and inconsistencies in relation to the things that happened in Washington, the things that were alleged to have been told to the police, now a lawyer, the things that were alleged to have obtained in the nature of restraining orders that there's absolutely no records of, notwithstanding records of many, many others things. So I just wanted to point out that one thing which I think is new and occurred to me after, Your Honor, I wrote the latest October 3rd letter. And that's it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9

THE COURT: Okay. Any response from the Government? MS. PENZA: Yes, Your Honor. Just briefly. I do want to just address in terms of an outcry witness, which I think is a lot of what Mr. Soloway has been basing his concerns about Ms. Fuller's testimony on. I don't think that there is any surprise that a 17-year-old girl wouldn't immediately go and tell someone when this was happening to Her father, who was really, in her own description of it, kept her in this constant state of mental abuse really her whole childhood. To hear Ms. Fuller describe it, when she talks about the sexual abuse, to her that was a limited instance and it -- all of the other abuse she suffered at his hands, including watching her brother be physically abused, that had a much greater impact on her life to the way she views it and why she made the decision to cut off contact with her father. So I think when we talk about inconsistencies in Ms. Fuller's testimony, I don't think it is surprising that a woman who has spent her life making a life for herself, trying to get away from this terrible childhood that she had that was filled with all of this trauma, that when these issues came to the surface again that she remembered things in bits and She didn't say that in Arizona something greater happened than what she had already talked about happening in California. She gives very detailed specifics about the sexual encounters and I think, if anything, during that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

interview that we presented first, she minimized some of the sexual behavior that was perpetrated on her. In light of all those things, I believe Ms. Fuller should be credited. And also all of the other statements she makes about her childhood, there is plenty of corroboration for.

This whole childhood of Mr. Fuller making false statements about being a veteran or being a member of the one of the armed forces, that's all been borne out during the sentencing process and the statements that he has made to probation, for example, and the statements he made to Special Agent Mullin. All of the -- even in her childhood he was feigning his disability and now we see that same thing happening in the courtroom today. All of those things I think add to the credibility of Ms. Fuller's testimony and I don't think any of the discrepancies that have been pointed out point to somebody who is -- she testified that she remembers clearly the instances of sexual abuse that she testify to. There were four very clear instances progressing in magnitude to ultimately her participating in masturbating him. I think that those should all be credited.

THE COURT: All right. Let me deal with the medical issues first. My finding on that is that this defendant does not have the muscular dystrophy. He is malingering for the purpose of obtaining special treatment in sentencing. It is a continuation of a practice that he started for the purpose of

obtaining drugs and I think there is overwhelming evidence in the record to support it.

First, other than his self-reporting of muscular dystrophy, there is nothing in the record to corroborate it.

Second, he has made many inconsistent statements as to when he developed muscular dystrophy. He told his treating physician, Dr. Anderson, that he was first diagnosed with it when he was in the Ukraine as an adult, but there is evidence in the record that at other times he has stated that he has had it since he was five years old.

Very significant to me, he has refused to undergo any testing at the MDC, which would prove or disprove his claim of muscular dystrophy. This procedure that they wanted to do on him, it is not regarded as a particularly painful test. It is uncomfortable with minor pain at worse. In fact, there is no evidence at all in the seven-year span of medical records that I have that he ever had a muscle biopsy or any other test would have confirmed or refuted his claim of muscular dystrophy.

Dr. Toy and Dr. Berchuck, who treated him prior to his incarceration, both stated that he was fully ambulatory, that he was not in a wheelchair and that in their opinion his abilities were inconsistent with an adult having muscular dystrophy. Dr. Toy also told -- be quiet, Mr. Fuller. Dr. Toy also told the Government that the defendant had told her

that he had muscular dystrophy but she never treated him for that, nor did she ever diagnosis him. She also stated that when he was with her, he was fully ambulatory. She did confirm that she prescribed pain medications but that these were related to the spinal surgery that she did on the defendant. She also stated that she had implanted a pain pump in his spine to control the dosage of his pain medications, but shortly after it was implanted, he told her to take it out, claiming that he was a scuba driver and an F-16 pilot and that the pump interfered with these activities.

Now, number one, the doctor is not making that up.

That's what he told her. Number two, the defendant was making that up; he is not a scuba driver and an F-16 pilot.

And, finally, Ms. Fuller testified at the Fatico hearing that in and around 1998 that he had to leave Idaho because the defendant's doctors wouldn't sign his Social Security forms. She testified he told her that the doctor said he was not disabled and he was just seeking drugs. Everything I have seen here is perfectly consistent with all of the other cases I have seen of drug-seeking tendencies.

I am not persuaded by the fact that Mr. Soloway has offered me that he was found disabled and got Social Security benefits. I deal with a lot of Social Security cases and I have seen too much in those cases, including the use of patient-friendly doctors and an overburdened system, to think

that it is not possible to obtaining a disability ruling by deceit and exaggeration, and I have not been given any Social Security records or medical records showing a diagnosis of muscular dystrophy other than through his reporting.

Now, I understand Mr. Soloway says well, even if he doesn't have it, he is still sick. We will talk about that as well when it comes time, but for now I find that he was malingering.

With regard to the sexual abuse issue, it is pretty close, but I can't find that the Government has sustained its burden of proving that he sexually abused Ms. Fuller when she was a minor. In her testimony, what Ms. Fuller did -- and there is nothing wrong with it, it is perfectly understandable -- she is piecing the timeline together circumstantially to figure out how old she was, like seeing snow on the roads as they went through the mountains. But what we are talking about here is a very confined period of a couple of months between her 17th and 18th birthday. There could have been late snow or there are some mountains that always have some snow and that's not enough to push me over the edge to find it more probable than that.

As Mr. Soloway pointed out, there are some inconsistencies in her testimony, like the Long Beach restraining order. Having said that, I don't have any doubt that he had, in fact, had a sexual relationship with her. I

found her thoroughly credible as to that aspect of her testimony. Her testimony about the sexual abuse is specific and really quite bizarre. A person is not going to make up a strange inclusion of a shoe string if all she wanted to do was incriminate her father. If she wanted to make something up, she could make up a more believable routine story of abuse. She really would have been more definite as to the age. She knew what it meant to establish firmly that she was 17 and yet she didn't. She circumstantially pieced it together instead of telling a story that might have been one that I might have accepted.

Her testimony at the Fatico hearing, I think there are a couple of differences, but it was largely the same as her taped interview with the FBI agent a couple of months prior to her in-court testimony.

I also thought she really attempted to downplay the gravity of the incident while testifying. It did not strike me as this is somebody out to get the defendant. Her demeanor on the stand showed me she was telling the truth. She seemed uncomfortable and often somewhat detached. She didn't get emotional or try to persuade me that her father was a bad guy. And as the Government points out, her testimony that the defendant would purchase military uniforms and pretend to be a veteran, that is amply corroborated by this record. This defendant has lied to everyone mentioned in the record about

that fact, from Mr. Tim where he used it to grift free room and board, to his doctors, to everyone he spoke to. So it is thoroughly corroborated as to that.

He even carried this military fantasy to an allegedly deceased wife who he told probation was shot down over Afghanistan while flying for the Ukrainian Air Force, even though there is no record of any woman being killed in Afghanistan in military circumstances.

Now, as far as Mr. Soloway's complaint about the lack of corroboration, I don't think that is at all unusual in cases of essentially non-consensual sex even she was over 18 at the time. It is clear to me from this record that he totally dominated his children and kept them in a constant state of discomfort and fear. So I am not going to apply the sentencing enhancement in guidelines 2G2.2(b)(5). I will, however, take his conduct with his daughter into account to the extent that it informs the 3553(a) analysis. So those are my findings on the only facts that I think were in dispute.

As to any other facts, I accept the unobjected to portions of the PSR, Sections A and C describing the offense and the offender characteristics.

Now, having established that factual basis for proceeding here today, let's talk next about the guidelines. I think we are in agreement -- first, I will note that the guidelines are merely advisory and only one factor for me to

16 consider in determining the appropriate sentence, but I think 1 2 those guidelines come out to an offense level of 28, a 3 Criminal History Category of one and a sentencing range of 78 4 to 97 months. Does anyone dispute that? MR. SOLOWAY: I think it is 78 to 87. 5 MS. PENZA: No, it is 97. You wrote it incorrectly, 6 7 I believe. I think Mr. Soloway wrote it incorrectly in his 8 last submission. 9 THE COURT: I have the chart. It is 97. 10 MR. SOLOWAY: If I wrote it incorrectly, that doesn't get me anywhere, right? 11 12 THE COURT: I'm afraid not. 13 That is my finding on the guidelines. Let me then 14 hear from the parties as to all of the factors under 3553(a). 15 I will start with you, Mr. Soloway. 16 MR. SOLOWAY: I want to raise an issue that I know 17 Your Honor has sort of previewed in your preliminary remarks 18 that relate to my client's medical history, something that you 19 said might be talked about later. I have indicated in the 20 submissions that I have made whether or not my client has, in 21 fact, established muscular dystropy, which I just pointed out 22 in passing, Ms. Zeilstrof, his ex-wife in paragraph 53 of the PSR said he does have. I am sure Your Honor has noticed that. 23 24 THE COURT: And he has told everybody that. He has. 25 MR. SOLOWAY: Yes, Judge. He has, from the medical

records that we have, an established illness relating to coronary issues which was corroborated not just by medical records from the hospital in Las Vegas but also from Dr. Anderson, who the MDC physician spoke to and was specifically told that he has coronary disease and five stents placed.

It is certainly true, Your Honor, that my client has been ambulatory. I mean, he walked in the airport, as the Government has established the day he was first detained when they took his devices, not when he was arrested, but when he was first detained, and now he is not ambulatory. He is in a wheelchair. That doesn't mean that he's not sick. He is over 60 years old, which doesn't mean that he has to be sick, by any means, but he has a confirmed history of serious back issue, coronary issues.

The back issues, I believe we only have records of one spine surgery, but I saw references to him having two back surgeries during his lifetime in some of the records. So he is in a lot of pain.

As Mr. Schneider pointed out in his records, there have been references to the inability of the BOP to maintain, and these I think came from Dr. Ross at Kingsbrook Jewish Medical Center, the many times that he was referred there for treatment for various problems, as recently as September. He was there for chest pains in September and I actually had a conversation with Dr. Ross about that. But there was nothing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

18

to write about. He came in and was discharged five days later, as late as September. And Dr. Ross, on the record, is saying that he really can't be maintained very well at the BOP and he's going to suffered much harsher conditions of confinement by virtue of his medical issues than would the average inmate, and that is something under 3553 that the Court may consider. It is going to be a very, very tough road for him.

Now, I know Your Honor has made a finding not that the enhancement applies with respect to the Fatico issues that we dealt with specifically relating to the disputed five points, but it really remains the case that, as identified at rather great length by Mr. Schneider, the guidelines, even according to the Sentencing Commission for this offense, are to the view of many courts somewhat not indicative of true culpability, and factors like whether or not a person has engaged in sexually dangerous activity, I think it's characterized, as were argued by Mr. Schneider, as well as the kind of course not all collectors are pedophiles. That issue has become muddied, obviously, even though Mr. Schneider wrote his letter to the Court after the PSR came out and was aware of, at least at that time, the allegation from Ms. Fuller. But I would argue that while a lot of the history and the characteristics of the defendant that have come out through this protracted sentencing proceeding have not in any way been

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

19

very helpful to Mr. Fuller's -- to the view of Mr. Fuller as at least expressed by his family, and also by some police officers who have encountered him in Washington, where he I mean, there are many -- I am sure Your Honor has read those reports which were made part of the record in the Fatico. But it is still the case that Mr. Fuller, who had these images on his device and has this issue literally from the mid 1990s with respect to his daughter, which I really don't mean to minimize in any way, is a 63-year-old man, in Criminal History Category I with no criminal record, with suggestions in the past that he has committed different kinds of fraud but has -- other than what has come out through family members during, again, this sentencing proceeding, no record whatsoever of ever committing any acts of violence against anybody, committing any serious crimes of violence, has never -- other than these kinds of scrapes with the law, which, again, passing bad checks have been suggested, things like that, seeking drugs. He has documented painful conditions over the course of his life. Figuring out what is a reasonable sentence and a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to deter Mr. Fuller, who has never been in prison, apparently, a day in his life and now is going to go through and now has been since obviously his arrest in this case, he -- the issues of what will deter him, what will be sufficient, all of the 3553 Factors call for in this case

of Criminal History Category I, I think a sentence at the bottom of the guidelines or below. That is my position.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I know Mr. Fuller wants to speak. Unless Your Honor has any questions for me, I really have nothing else to add.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Soloway.

Mr. Fuller, I will hear from you.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand you made whatever you call it, a ruling, a finding about my medical history. Your Honor, in 1984, after a heart attack on the sports fishing boat in San Diego, I was taken to Cabrio Hospital in San The doctors found that I didn't have a heart attack because there was one enzyme in their cardiac enzymes was missing. But my employer wouldn't let me back to work. I was working on a classified project for the U.S. Navy by my employer, Planning Research Corporation. Their records still exist. They forced me to continue going to doctors until they could find out what was wrong with me to know that I would be safe to work on San Clemente Island, a Naval preserve off the coast of San Diego in Los Angeles. I was found and directed to a doctor at UCSD Medical Center by the name of Richard Haas, H-A-A-S. This man took two years, did a number of muscle biopsies. I still have the scar on my leg. biopsies were taken as far as Israel and into Germany. They wrote articles on it that are still available on the internet. In 1985, they made their diagnosis and filled out forms for

Social Security and submitted for my disability, 100 percent disability. Social Security, as I'm told they normally do, routinely refuse this the first time, asked for more information. And in 1986, Social Security found that yes, indeed, I met all of their requirements. They had shown the muscle fibers. They had shown the biopsies. They had shown my blood work. And for the entire time, despite Nanette's testimony that people say that they refused to sign my form, never has any doctor refused to sign my form. Year after year after year they were submitted to Social Security signed by legitimate doctors all over the west. Social Security has never questioned. And after ten years, they dropped. They have never again asked me to submit a form.

Doctors do not always listen carefully when you are talking to them, especially emergency room doctors who are not trained in specialized diseases. The fact that Dr. Toy said I didn't treat you for muscular dystrophy is absolutely correct. I was sent to her as a reference from Dr. Berchuck after my spinal surgery. It doesn't mean that I don't have muscular dystrophy. It means she simply failed to seek the records that she should have done. She knew that I was there as a muscular dystrophy patient. Everyone in the office knows that's what I was there as. And the simple truth is ask any specialist in neurological diseases, like I have, they will say you cannot treat muscular dystrophy, you treat the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22

symptoms of muscular dystrophy. So, yes, these doctors starting way back, and actually in 1972, started giving me muscle relaxers and pain medicines when they didn't even know what I had. By 1986, with the final diagnosis, these doctors continually prescribed them and I've been on them continuously since 1984. No doctor has ever refused to prescribe them for me. There's no record with any state DEA or the federal DEA that I've ever abused the drugs. I take them because the doctors prescribe them to relieve the conditions I have.

As to -- for me, the issue of malignant lingering, the statement from these people that I walked into the airport, that's absolutely right. I had medicines at the time, my muscle relaxers and my pain medicines, and from getting off the airplane and all of the airlines that I travel on have me registered as a disabled person requiring a wheelchair. They wheel you up to the customs line. You have to get out and stand in line and go through customs. So, yes, I walked; I did what I had to do. At that time I could still walk 10, 15 feet without too much problem. If I had something to lean on, handrails in various places or a table, I could stand for maybe five minutes. The problem is is during this period of time after being stopped at the airport in March of 2016, I've had no medicines. So my condition, which is a degenerative, progressive, terminal disease has progressed. have gotten steadily worse. I can no longer stand. I can no

longer walk. I'm confined to the wheelchair.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My hope is if I would be able to be released that I would be able to go on to Dallas for the scheduled surgery with Dr. Berchuck to remedy what he did to me back in 2014 and that's nip a nerve in my right leg and in my spinal section where he put the rods in. He hoped to correct that. That's what I came here for specifically.

Now, I would like to say one thing. What is mentioned here continuously is family. Unfortunately, I am crippled by the fact that in March of 2014, Mr. Putin invaded my home in Crimea. My family, the people that I consider as family are all trapped there. The person who wrote the e-mail that you have that they used as a reason to stop me, my granddaughter, Malina Lori Fuller, who at the time was 19, is still in Crimea. I'm crippled by the fact that I can't get anybody to come here to defend me. I have no living relatives in the United States, no one here to help me. My only people that could be testified are inside of Crimea and unable to come to testify. My reputation has been repeatedly slandered. I have had nobody to stand for my side of the story. You know, I feel extremely insulted just because this -- I have forgotten her name now. Ms. Main, I think it was, that took down the notice, who wrote down a paraphrasing of what I said about my wife Irena. Irena was flying one of our company-owned airline planes, a cargo plane over Afghanistan.

She was shot down by an American-made Stinger missile. There are records of it all over Europe. To say that she doesn't exist or Ms. Main's translation into that that she was flying for the Ukrainian Air Force. My wife had been a Soviet pilot in her youth, but when the Soviet Union broke up, she wounded her airline and she was a pilot for that system. Those records are still available in Crimea. They're still available in Kiev, Ukraine. My trips back and forth, my family, my flat that I still owe 20 months of back lease payments on the flat in Odessa, they're all available overseas, but they are not available to defend myself here in this country.

I have never feigned an illness. That information
-- I would much rather have been able to work. I earned over
\$64,000 a year in 1984 and I did \$1,200 a month ever since
Nanette and her mother managed to get my third-party
disability cancelled there in Idaho by their claims that there
was nothing wrong with regard to me. Social Security and the
Federal Government has consistently said yes, there is
something wrong with you, your medical records show it. You
have been treated for it for 58 years. To say I don't have
it and just because people like to change what they hear,
doesn't make it so that I don't have it.

THE COURT: Okay.

I will hear from the Government.

MS. PENZA: Your Honor, just very briefly, I am not going to further discuss the claims of muscular dystrophy as it was reported in the findings. I will state that in speaking to Dr. Berchuck there was no scheduled surgery planned.

The one thing I do want to raise, which we do have voluminous briefing in this case, but this is somebody who, despite having had no criminal history, has spent his life committing crimes and he has been -- and the concern is that he spent his life terrorizing people who are more vulnerable than he is. I think that is part of the charged conduct here. We see these are girls who -- the images of the girls that he had and was distributing as part, although he was only convicted of possession, although there was distribution there, every time their images are distributed, they're victimized over and over again, and then his own daughter and his own son and his ex-wife. This is somebody who I think there is very serious concerns about recidivism and he has lived a life of violence and a live of lies.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Very briefly.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I didn't think of all of this at the time. My daughter conveniently refuses to say to anybody that at the time she claims this stuff was happening she was never ever alone. My father and my mother raised her.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

When my mother finally died, Nanette took great offense to my marriage to the Russian woman, Irena Savrinskaya. The person that she identifies as my girlfriend, Gerry, was, in fact, Nanette's friend. She was someone we met at the bowling alley up in Chandler, Arizona known as Kyrene Lanes. Nanette took to her and her friend. Gerry was there living with us in the house in Arizona before my mother died, after my mother died. My wife Irena was living with us. Nanette had ample opportunity if she believes these things happened -- they are total fantasy -- that she could have told somebody. drove with us, as did my wife, to Idaho. Gerry then left. There was no relationship between me and Gerry other than as friends, who my daughter met at the bowling alley and we all became friendly. But I was married. There was no way anything was going to be going on. The implication that I spent an entire life terrorizing people. My daughter was provided with the best of everything. She insists on saying we stayed at cheesy motels.

When my mother's house was sold, we didn't stay at a hotel. I got the settlement from the title agent and my real estate agent and we immediately got in the Jeep Grand Cherokee we had and drove to Las Vegas. There's pictures on that computer of that trip. We went on directly to Idaho where we had an apartment where all of us lived. Nanette was bought scuba diving lessons. That's where the story about the scuba

and the F-16 is. It's always been a joke. I bought Nanette scuba diving lessons. At that time, in 1998, I could still scuba dive, shallow depths. But she wanted to become a Sea World trainer. I spent thousands and thousands of dollars on this young woman trying to get her happy, but she would not be happy. She didn't like Irena.

THE COURT: Mr. Fuller, I need you to conclude, please.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. The pictures on that computer are the property of my granddaughter Malina Lori Fuller and her cousin, my granddaughter, Yullia Emily Kolishikova. The computers are registered in their names with Apple. They have their own folders, their own logins. I was simply transporting the computer to the U.S., the hard drive, the external hard drive because it was failing. I promised to get it fixed for them. None of this belongs to me. I see no violence in any of it.

The episode with Eric is a total lie. The records of Pinal County Sheriff show he was never abused. In fact, he assaulted my mother from which she died four months later and they took him away. I did nothing to him. There's no record of it.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Fuller.

I have considered all of the applicable factors under 3553(a), including the sentencing guidelines, the first

factor in the statute is the nature of the crime and the circumstances of the offense. It is child pornography. There is not an ounce of remorse. There is continuing denial. These children in these pictures, which I am forced to look at, shows them effectively being tortured. Instead of owning up like some of my defendants who have a problem with this kind of material do, Mr. Fuller continues to disclaim any involvement at all. That makes it a crime of the utmost seriousness and the circumstances of the utmost aggravation.

The second factor in the statute is the history and characteristics of the defendant. This is obviously a unique character I am dealing with and I do not mean that in a positive way. I am not seeing any substantial mitigating factors in his character. He is liar and a grifter of epic proportions. He has made up the most outlandish stories, even if I start with what he has just told me. You know, he has had two of the best sentencing lawyers that this district has and I don't have an ounce of anything to back up what he told me. I have defendants from foreign countries. I have defendants from China who get me things to back up what they are saying. I have nothing now, as the doctors never had, but Mr. Fuller's statement.

It is part of my job to judge con men and I am dealing with one here. And like any con men doing the long con, Mr. Fuller has convinced himself. It doesn't make it

true. It doesn't make any of it true.

Telling the probation officer that he has 24 children, including 17 from his marriage to Rienna. They adopted 14, but he couldn't recall their names, that he married one of his ex-wife's sisters after they were divorced, and that one of his ex-wife's, he says the probation officer misheard, was not a combat pilot but was flying a cargo plan over Afghanistan when she was shot down. It's nonsense. I accept none of it. It makes it worse that Mr. Fuller will not acknowledge that he has been exposed.

As far as the emotional abuse of children, I have no doubt whatsoever. Ms. Fuller's testimony on this establishes that he physically abused his son. She described how she was controlled, not allowed to participate in school activities or sports or even allowed to have friends. I don't know, maybe he did spend thousands for scuba diving lessons, but if he did, that's because he wanted to, not that he wanted her to do what she wanted to. Teaching her that she should be seen and not heard, that he once used a belt on her brother. I find it all entirely credible.

As to the medical history, which Mr. Soloway has tried his best to salvage, yes, he may have something, but when I am dealing with someone who so easily fabricates medical conditions and tells doctors things that are inconsistent and untrue, I can't ascertain what it is, I can't

ascertain the seriousness. Yes, there are all these medical records back before 1984 and somehow the two lawyers who are really good lawyers, they can't find them. Just like oh, it is Mr. Putin's fault for invading the Ukraine and, therefore, we can't get any evidence out off the Ukraine. I have had evidence out of the Ukraine. There are ways to do it. It's not even that hard.

The next factor I have to consider is respect for law. Mr. Fuller has zero respect for law, not at all uncommon with narcissists. They come first; the law comes second. The law is just something that gets in their way from time to time.

The next factor is specific deterrence. I agree with the Government that because Mr. Fuller has no respect for the law, because he is a con man who has convinced himself of the con, he is going to do whatever he wants, whatever sentence I impose. There is no deterring a person like this.

And as far as the guidelines in child pornography cases sometimes being excessive, they often are. They are not here. This is a situation that the guidelines really were meant to address. If there is a problem in the guidelines is that they treat this situation as the mainstream when, in fact, this is not at all mainstream, but it falls squarely into what the guidelines were contemplating, a very totally deprayed individual who has no connection with the moral

standards that govern society.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Based on those and the other sentencing factors in 3553(a), I sentence the defendant to 97 months custody, supervised release of five years with the following special conditions: Registry as a sex offender as required by federal and state law. Participation in mental health treatment programs, including treatment for sexual disorders. He has to pay for those to the extent that he is able to and he has to make disclosure to probation of all finances that he has. He has to undergo polygraph examinations where directed. shall not associate with other convicted sex offenders. will not associate with any children under the age of 18 unless a responsible adult is present and he has prior approval from the Probation Department. If he lives with anybody who has minor children, he must inform that person that he is a convicted sex offender.

In addition, any residence, employment and volunteer work he undertakes will be approved by the Probation

Department. He will not reside anywhere where minor children reside or work for any business that has anyone under 18 working there without the permission of the Probation

Department.

I will also impose a search condition giving the Probation Department, upon reasonable suspicion of contraband, to enter anyplace where he lives, works, frequents or any car

that he drives. He can have access to a computer, but he may not access pornography of any kind, pornography including sexually explicit conduct. He shall not view any pictures of naked children.

He shall cooperate with the U.S. Probation's

Department of Computer and Internet Monitoring Program. He

will identify any computer or internet accessible devices that

he has. He will not go to any dating websites or anything

else that seeks to match people together for establishing

personal relationships.

He has to utilize one pharmacy and only one pharmacy for all prescription medications. He shall use only one physician for all prescription medications if those medications are opiate-based.

In addition, he will not possess any firearm, ammunition or destructive device.

Those are the conditions of supervised release.

I will not impose a fine because if we accept his financial statement at face value, which I guess we have to do, he cannot afford a fine. I will impose the mandatory \$100 special assessment.

Open counts?

MS. PENZA: Your Honor, I believe there is one open count.

THE COURT: I believe so too.

MS. PENZA: The Government moves to dismiss Count 1 2 One of the indictment. 3 THE COURT: The motion is granted. 4 If Mr. Fuller wants to appeal his sentence, he has waived his right to appeal his conviction by pleading guilty. 5 6 Does his plea agreement contain an appeal waiver? It does. It is 108 months. 7 MS. PENZA: 8 THE COURT: So he has waived his right to appeal his 9 conviction and his sentence, but if he nevertheless wishes to 10 contend there is something fundamentally unfair with any 11 aspect of these proceedings, includes his conviction and 12 sentence, he must get a notice of appeal filed within 14 days. 13 Mr. Soloway can file that, the clerk will file it. If Mr. 14 Fuller certifies that he cannot afford a lawyer or he can file 15 the one-page form himself. But no matter how he delegates it, 16 it remains his responsibility to see to it that it gets filed 17 within 14 days, because if it does not, he will have no 18 opportunity to appeal whatsoever. 19 Anything further? THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, the Probation 20 21 Department wanted to see if the Court would be interested in 22 imposing, it's a new special condition for electronic 23 communication service accounts, such as clouds and e-mail 24 services. May I read the condition to Your Honor?

Please.

THE COURT:

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

34

THE PROBATION OFFICER: The defendant shall report to the probation office any and all electronic communications service accounts as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2510, Subsection 15, for user communications, dissemination and/or storage of digital media files. This includes but is not limited to e-mail accounts, social media accounts and cloud storage accounts. The defendant shall provide each account identifier and password and shall report the creation of new accounts, changes in identifiers and/or passwords, transfer, suspension and/or deletion of any account within five days of such action. THE COURT: Granted. THE PROBATION OFFICER: Thank you. THE COURT: Anything else? MR. SOLOWAY: Just a recommendation. THE COURT: What are you asking for? MR. SOLOWAY: Somewhere in the -- well, he is specifically asking for designation to a facility in Fort Worth, a BOP facility in Fort Worth, Texas. THE COURT: Would he rather have Texas or a medical center? It is a medical center in Texas. THE DEFENDANT: THE COURT: I will recommend that he be evaluated, as the BOP does in any event, and if appropriate, assigned to a medical center in Texas.

```
35
                  Thank you. We are adjourned.
 1
                  MS. PENZA: Thank you, Your Honor.
 2
 3
     I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
 4
 5
                                                        December 11, 2017
 6
          /s/ Michele D. Lucchese
           Michele D. Lucchese
 7
                                                             DATE
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```